17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	Adam P. Segal, Esq.							
2	Nevada Bar No. 6120							
	Dana B. Krulewitz, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 11180							
3	BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK,	LLP						
4	100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600 Las Vegas, Nevada 89106-4614							
5	Telephone: (702) 382-2101							
6	Facsimile: (702) 382-8135							
	Email: asegal@bhfs.com Email: dkrulewitz@bhfs.com							
7	Zinan. aktalewitz@oms.com							
8	Attorneys for Plaintiffs							
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
10	DISTRICT OF NEVADA							
11	TRUSTEES OF THE TEAMSTERS	Case No. 2:10-cv-01354-LDG-PAL						
12	LOCAL 631 SECURITY FUND FOR							
	SOUTHERN NEVADA,							
13	Plaintiffs,	PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO						
14	VS.	DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE						
15	vo.	SETTLEMENT CONTENENCE						
16	NEVADA READY MIX CORPORATION,							

Plaintiffs, the Trustees of the Teamsters Local 631 Security Fund for Southern Nevada (hereinafter "Security Fund"), hereby oppose Defendant Nevada Ready Mix Corporation's ("NRM") Motion for Settlement Conference ("NRM's Motion").

Defendant.

NRM does not cite to any rule or other authority for its Motion. If one assumes, even though NRM does not so state, that its Motion is pursuant to Local Rule 16-5, that rule is limited to "appropriate" cases for a settlement conference. This case is not yet such a case. Specifically, the Security Fund does not believe a settlement conference is appropriate or beneficial at this time. Discovery in this case has just begun and the parties have only recently exchanged initial

a Delaware Corporation,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

disclosures. The parties' discovery schedule was just filed a few weeks ago. (Dkt. 14.) Neither party has propounded any discovery yet. Discovery is currently scheduled to continue until March 1, 2011. *Id*.

The current record, therefore, is little more than the Security Fund's demand for delinquent contributions and NRM's refusal to pay the demanded amount. Thus, the Security Fund intends to conduct discovery and ascertain NRM's defenses, if any. Because that has not occurred vet, the Security Fund is not in position to discuss settlement.

Moreover, as NRM points out in its Motion, the Security Fund asked NRM to provide its settlement offer to the Security Fund on October 21, 2010, but NRM failed to do so. The Security Fund is not inclined to learn of NRM's position regarding settlement for the first time in a settlement conference, where the only possible response will be to take it under advisement, research and evaluate it.

While there may come a time when it is appropriate to conduct settlement negotiations, first the Security Fund must conduct discovery and determine what, if any, defenses to its claims exist that might justify any compromise settlement. Absent that, the Security Fund simply will not settle, so there is no reason to have a settlement conference at this time.

Finally, NRM's concerns over accruing interest and liquidated damages are easily laid to rest: NRM should simply pay any undisputed amounts now. Further, it should present the Security Fund with any settlement positions or defenses for consideration now, instead of awaiting to reveal its secret positions in a forced settlement conference.

///

///

///

///

2

Case 2:10-cv-01354-LDG-PAL Document 18 Filed 11/12/10 Page 3 of 4

	1	Based on the above, the Security Fund requests that the Court deny NRM's Motion for								
	2	Settlement Conference.								
	3	Dated this 12 th day of November, 2010.	BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER							
	4		SCHRECK, LLP							
	5	By: /s/ Dana Krulewitz								
	6		/: /s/ Dana Krulewitz Adam P. Segal, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 6120							
	7		Dana B. Krulewitz, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 11180							
	8		100 N. City Parkway, Suite 1600 Las Vegas, Nevada 89106							
	9		Las Vegas, Nevada 89106 Telephone: (702) 382-2101 Facsimile: (702) 382-8135							
	10		Attorneys for Plaintiffs							
>	11									
4614	12									
4V 89106-	13									
LAS VEGAS, NV 89106-4614 (702) 382-2101	14									
LAS	15									
	16									
	17									
	18									
	19									
	20									
	21									
	22									
	23									
	24									
	25									
	26									
	27									
	28									

BROWNSTEIN HYATT FARBER SCHRECK, LLP

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am employed by the law firm of Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP in Clark County. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action. My business address is 100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106-4614.

On the 12th day of November, 2010, I served the document(s), described as:

PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE

by placing the	original 🔀 a	true copy	thereof end	closed in a	sealed enve	lope add	ressed
as follows:							

a. **ECF System** (You must attach the "Notice of Electronic Filing", or list all persons and addresses and attach additional paper if necessary)

Norman H. Kirshman, Esq. 700 South Third Street Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Email: kirshmanlaw@yahoo.com

Attorney for Defendant

b. **BY U.S. MAIL.** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Las Vegas, Nevada. The envelope(s) were mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am readily familiar with Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice, documents are deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on the same day which is stated in the proof of service, with postage fully prepaid at Las Vegas, Nevada in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of party served, service is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after the date stated in this proof of service.

C	$\mathbf{R}\mathbf{V}$	PER	SON	AT.	SERVICE	

d. BY DIRECT EMAIL

e. BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

By: /s/ Kathleen Bratton
An Employee of Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP

20036\111\1464084.3